

Sociology 271A – Introduction to Methods of Sociological Research  
Fall 2019 – Tuesday-Thursday, 12noon-2pm, 402 Barrows

Professor Samuel R. Lucas

Office: 438 Barrows Hall

Phone: 642-4765 or 642-4766

E-mail address: [lucas@berkeley.edu](mailto:lucas@berkeley.edu)

Office hours: Tuesdays, 9:45-11:45am and 4:15-5:15pm (**but check web-site for updates**)

Home-page: <http://www.samuelroundfieldlucas.com/>

This introductory graduate level course in research methods is designed to sensitize you to fundamental principles of systematic investigation of the social world. But, you may ask, *which* so-called fundamental principles? Good question! As post-Kuhnian scholars, we know that so-called fundamental principles are neither universal nor self-evident. Yet, lacking a coherent shared language of research—I am sure you each have *some* such language, but it is unlikely that we all share it—it is imperative that we take some steps forward to establish, and then critique, a shared language. Of course, there are other ways we might proceed, and, frankly, I believe that if we had a full year (or more), and not much else to do, a more inductive approach would be effective and, perhaps, even more fun. *But*, perhaps unfortunately, time demands and bureaucratic university organizational design prevent this immersion approach, so I am proposing a more deductive approach for our work this term.

### Course Aim

My aim in this course is exposure and understanding—I want to expose you to research design as a language, and help you understand its (differing) logic(s). I ask your indulgence, in that it is very tough to get off the ground of language study if the very phonemes of the language are immediately problematized. However, our increasing shared sense of that language will soon make critical assessment possible.

If, by the end of the course, you find the logics we address useful in your own research and in your effort to assess other research, great! Alternatively, if you find the logics problematic, and you blaze a different path, great!—perhaps I'll be able to be credited someday for so clearly revealing the logic and weaknesses of current practice to you (perhaps doing so inadvertently, with my own research efforts :- ) !), that you were stricken with such a blazing insight that you were able to reveal a better, more effective, set of logics and approaches. Should that occur, I will happily bask in your reflected glory!

*This* term, however, my aim is considerably more modest—I only want you to *see* the logic others have used or *not* used. Your acceptance or rejection of those logics is up to you, and, actually, I would be disappointed if you did not expose these claims to critical assessment at some point. I posit, however, that at the outset our work to articulate a shared language will aid your future trajectory, whether it leads to critical re-assessment, reasoned acceptance, or both.

### Evaluation

Hmm. Well, if we can reject this stuff, then how will grades be assigned? Good question!

Grades are not really the stuff of graduate education, but they are bureaucratically required. So, the assignments will call on you to demonstrate understanding. That is, you should demonstrate that you understand a position, even if you disagree with it. This will entail adopting a critical posture toward positions with which you do not agree *and* toward positions with which you do agree. Not every argument in favor of a position may be coherent.

As for the assignments, they have two main purposes that are far more important than grades. One purpose of the assignments is to help you solidify your understanding of various methods and logics. The second, equally important, purpose is to help you proceed forward in your developing research agenda.

There are two types of assignments, each of which emphasizes one of the two important purposes more than the other. One type of assignment can be called “proposals and pieces thereof.” The other type of assignment can be called “design reviews.”

### The Proposal and Pieces Thereof

By the end of the term you will have drafted a research proposal. During the term you will need to draft and hand in for comment various pieces of the proposal. These pieces, due at different moments during the term, are first drafts of the segments of the proposal. The pieces are graded on a S/U scale. The proposal, due at the end of the term, is graded on an A-F scale.

The expectation is that final proposals will be of high quality, worthy of submission for grants (e.g., National Science Foundation funding) and/or to be taken into the field and used to conduct research—with the proviso that budgetary limitations can be ignored for the proposals you will prepare for this class. Assignments explicitly leading to and composing the final proposal are marked with an asterisk (\*) when noted in the schedule.

### Design Reviews

Design Reviews place you into dialogue with a variety of research approaches. On five Tuesdays I will require a short design review of an assigned reading. Each design review is graded Pass/No Pass. If you receive a NP grade on a design review, you must submit a new design review using another paper that uses the same method that I will assign to you, due one week from when I returned the graded assignment. If you again receive an NP on that assignment, you have one more chance with a third paper I will assign, due one week after I return the second version. Whether or not the third design review is an NP, that will be the final chance to complete a design review for that method. In order to pass the class you must obtain a passing grade on 5 design reviews, one for each of the major methods that are the focus of the course.

As the semester goes forward, the knowledge you can bring to bear to prepare your design reviews should vastly increase. Throughout the term, however, it will be necessary for you to link your analysis directly to the other material we have covered to that point in class (e.g., please use citations, refer to the concepts covered). Parenthetically, reviews may contain negative or positive assessments, but, either claim requires an accompanying analysis. In other words, merely

asserting “The author was wrong (or right) to do X” is insufficient. We need to know what makes it wrong (or right) for the author to do X, and what is the cost (or benefit) of this analytic transgression (or feature), and, ideally, what the author should have done.

Below I provide a “Calendar of Written Assignments.” Note that one assignment is in bold. Outside the final proposal, this assignment is the **most important written assignment of the term!** One cannot write a strong proposal without being able to write a strong methods section. We will conduct an important exercise in class that day so that no reading is required that day.

#### Calendar of Written Assignments

Assignment	Proposal	Other	Due
Empirical Research Question	X		Sep 5
Design Review, Experiment		X	Sep 24
Design Review, Survey Research		X	Oct 8
Design Review, Qualitative Interviewing		X	Oct 22
Literature Review Section	X		Oct 29
Design Review, Ethnography		X	Nov 5
Design Review, Comparative Historical		X	Nov 19
<b>Methods Section</b>	<b>X</b>		<b>Nov 26</b>
Final Proposal	X		Dec 16

#### Deadlines

No late work will be accepted, and no incompletes will be given in this class.

#### Texts

Much of the reading material is available via JSTOR, some can be accessed by using OskiCat, the University database of materials, to find an electronic location accessible via the University of California-Berkeley library, and some can be accessed by using Google Scholar to access electronically (perhaps also using a connection through the University). If electronic access proves impossible, most such items can also be obtained by going to the library and making a hardcopy. Other articles and chapters are in a Reader that you may purchase at Copy Central, 2411 Telegraph Avenue. In addition, the following seven books are required. Ones marked **OskiCat** are available in electronic form through the library web-site. Others should be purchased via amazon.com, some other online source, or directly from the publisher:

Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin

Carmines, Edward G., and Richard A. Zeller. 1979. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Converse, Jean M., and Stanley Presser. 1986. *Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Hand, David J. 2016. *Measurement: A Very Short Introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. **OskiCat**

Kalton, Graham. 1983. *Introduction to Survey Sampling*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Weiss, Robert S. 1994. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York, NY: The Free Press. (Pp. 1-14; 39-181).

Whyte, William Foote. 1943. *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum, fourth edition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Note that Hand will be discussed September 3, Carmines & Zeller on September 5, and Kalton on September 10. These are the first three books we will discuss, and they are needed fairly early, such that one should not delay in acquiring them. Except for the 4 books above that do not seem to be available electronically, below you will find a source (JSTOR, Google Scholar, OskiCat, Reader) listed in bold after each citation.

### **For Those Who Have Never Taken Sociological Methods**

This is a graduate level introduction to methods. As such, it assumes persons have taken undergraduate sociological methods. If you have not taken such a course, you may stay in the course. However, you should expect to spend time getting up to speed; this is the only alternative as this is the only required methods course in the Ph.D. program, and thus it has much to cover that is beyond what is covered in undergraduate methods classes.

## **READING and ASSIGNMENT SCHEDULE**

### **PART I – INTRODUCTORY MATTERS**

**>>Week 1, Aug 29 – Introduction**

**August 29 -- Introduction: Basics and Purposes of Research**

### **PART II – FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLES**

**>>Week 2, Sep 3-5 – Measurement, Reliability, and Validity**

**September 3 – Measurement**

Hand, David J. 2016. *Measurement: A Very Short Introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. **OskiCat**

Bollen, Kenneth A. 1980. "Issues in the Comparative Measurement of Political Democracy." *American Sociological Review* 45: 370-390. **JSTOR**

**September 5 – Reliability and Validity**

Carmines, Edward G., and Richard A. Zeller. 1979. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Bannigan, Katrina, and Roger Watson. 2009. "Reliability and Validity in a Nutshell." *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 18: 3237-3243. **Google Scholar**

**EMPIRICAL RESEARCH QUESTION DUE SEPTEMBER 5 (S/U)\***

**>> Week 3, Sep 10 - 12 – Case Selection and Inferential Transfer**

**September 10 – Case Selection**

Kruskal, William, and Frederick Mosteller. 1980. "Representative Sampling, IV: the History of the Concept in Statistics, 1895-1939." *International Statistical Review* 48: 169-195. **JSTOR**

Kalton, Graham. 1983. *Introduction to Survey Sampling*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

**September 12 – Case Selection and Inferences**

- Berk, Richard A. 1983. "An Introduction to Sample Selection Bias in Sociological Data." *American Sociological Review* 48: 386-398. **JSTOR**
- Firestone, William A. 1993. "Alternative Arguments for Generalizing From Data as Applied to Qualitative Research." *Educational Researcher* 22; 4: 16-22. **Google Scholar**
- Lucas, Samuel R. 2014. "Beyond the Existence Proof: Ontological Conditions, Epistemological Implications, and In-Depth Interview Research." *Quality & Quantity* 48: 387-408. **Google Scholar**

### **PART III – BASIC DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS**

#### **>> Week 4, Sep 17-19 – Experiments and Quasi-Experiments**

##### **September 17 – Design of Experiments and Threats to Proper Inference**

Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin

##### **September 19 – Examples of Experiments**

Lovaglia, Michael T., Jeffrey W. Lucas, Jeffrey A. Houser, Shane R Thye, and Barry Markovsky. 1998. "Status Processes and Mental Ability Test Scores." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 195-228. **JSTOR**

Yinger, John. 1986. "Measuring Racial Discrimination with Fair Housing Audits: Caught in the Act." *American Economic Review* 76: 881-893. **JSTOR**

Heckman, James J., and Brook S. Payner. 1989. "Determining the Impact of Federal Anti-Discrimination Policy on the Economic Status of Blacks: A Study of South Carolina." *American Economic Review* 79: 138-177. **JSTOR**

#### **>> Week 5, Sep 24-26 – Survey Research**

##### **September 24 – Survey Research**

Converse, Jean M., and Stanley Presser. 1986. *Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Groves, Robert M. 2011. "Three Eras of Survey Research." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75: 861-871. **JSTOR**

Mize, Trenton D. 2016. "Sexual Orientation in the Labor Market." *American Sociological*

Review 81: 1132-1160. **JSTOR**

Design Review due **September 24** of: Experiment

Feinberg, Matthew, Robb Willer, Jennifer Stellar, and Dacher Keltner. 2012. "The Virtues of Gossip: Reputational Information Sharing as Prosocial Behavior." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 102: 1015-1030. **Google Scholar**

### **September 26 – Selected Issues in Survey Research**

Loftus, Elizabeth F., Mark R. Klinger, Kyle D. Smith, and Judith Fielder. 1990. "A Tale of Two Questions: Benefits of Asking More Than One Question." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 54: 330-345. **JSTOR**

Kreuter, Frauke, Stanley Presser, and Roger Tourangeau. 2008. "Social Desirability Bias in CATI, IVR, and Web Surveys: The Effects of Mode and Question Sensitivity." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72: 847-865. **JSTOR**

Krosnick, Jon A., Allyson L. Holbrook, Matthew K. Berent, Richard T. Carson, W. M. Hanneman, Raymond J. Kopp, Robert C. Mitchell, Stanley Presser, Paul A. Ruud, V. K. Smith, Wendy R. Moody, Melanie C. Green, and Michael Conaway. 2002. "The Impact of "No Opinion" Response Options on Data Quality: Non-Attitude Reduction or an Invitation to Satisfice?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 66: 371-403. **JSTOR**

Moore, Jeffrey C., Linda L. Stinson, and E. J. Welniak. Jr. 2000. "Income Measurement Error in Surveys: A Review." *Journal of Official Statistics* 16: 331-62. **Google Scholar**

### **>> Week 6, Oct 1-3 – Survey Research: Extensions and Critique**

#### **October 1 – Extensions of Survey Research**

Lax, Jeffrey R., Justin H. Phillips, and Alissa F. Stollwerk. 2016. "Are survey respondents lying about their support for same-sex marriage? Lessons from a list experiment." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 80: 510-533. **Google Scholar**

Corstange, Daniel. 2009. "Sensitive questions, truthful answers? Modeling the list experiment with LISTIT." *Political Analysis* 17: 45-63. **JSTOR**

Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly, and Reed Larson. 2014. "Validity and reliability of the experience-sampling method," pp. 35-54 in *Flow and the Foundations of Positive Psychology: The Collected Works of Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi*. Dordrecht: Springer **OskiCat**

#### **October 3 – Selected Complexities and Critical Assessments of Survey Research**

Huang, Min-Hsiung. 2009. "Race of the Interviewer and the black-white test score gap." *Social Science Research* 38: 29-38. **OskiCat**

Suchman, Lucy, and Brigitte Jordan. 1990. "Interactional Troubles in Face-to-Face Survey Interviews." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 85: 232-241. **JSTOR**

Fienberg, Stephen F. 1990. "Comment on 'Interactional Troubles in Face-to-Face Survey Interviews'." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 85: 241-244. **JSTOR**

Hahn, Robert A. 1990. "Comment on 'Interactional Troubles in Face-to-Face Survey Interviews'." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 85: 244-246. **JSTOR**

## >> Week 7, Oct 8 - 10 – Qualitative Interviewing

### October 8 – Qualitative Interviewing

Weiss, Robert S. 1994. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York, NY: The Free Press. (Pp. 1-14; 39-181).

Sykes, Jennifer, Katrin Križ, Kathryn Edin, and Sarah Halpern-Meekin. 2015. "Dignity and Dreams: What the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) Means to Low-Income Families." *American Sociological Review* 80: 243-267. **Google Scholar**

Design Review due **October 8** of: Survey Research

Killewald, Alexandra. 2016. "Money, Work, and Marital Stability: Assessing Change in the Gendered Determinants of Divorce." *American Sociological Review* 81: 696-719. **OskiCat**

### October 10 – Selected Complexities of Qualitative Interviewing

Herzog, Hanna. 2012. "Interview Location and Its Social Meaning," pp. 207-218 from *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium, James A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti, and Karyn D. McKinney. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Cook, Kay E. 2012. "Stigma and the Interview Encounter," pp. 333-344 from *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium, James A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti, and Karyn D. McKinney. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Lillrank, Annika. 2012. "Managing the Interviewer Self," pp. 281-294 from *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium, James



A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti, and Karyn D. McKinney. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

## >> Week 8, Oct 15-17 – Qualitative Interviewing: Analysis and Critique

### October 15 – Analyzing Qualitative Interview Data

Charmaz, Kathy, and Linda Liska Belgrave. 2012. “Qualitative Interviewing and Grounded Theory Analysis,” pp. 347-366 from *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium, James A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti, and Karyn D. McKinney. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Riessman, Catherine Kohler. 2012. “Analysis of Personal Narratives,” pp. 367-380 from *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium, James A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti, and Karyn D. McKinney. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Seale, Clive, and Carol Rivas. 2012. “Using Software to Analyze Qualitative Interviews,” pp. 427-440 from *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium, James A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti, and Karyn D. McKinney. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

### October 17 – Selected Critical Assessments of Qualitative Interviewing

Jerolmack, Colin and Shamus Khan. 2014. “Talk is Cheap: Ethnography and the Attitudinal Fallacy.” *Sociological Methods and Research* 43: 236-247. **Google Scholar**

Cerulo, Karen A. 2014. “Reassessing the Problem: Response to Jerolmack and Khan.” *Sociological Methods and Research* 43: 219-226. **Google Scholar**

DiMaggio, Paul. 2014. “Comment on Jerolmack and Khan, ‘Talk is Cheap’: Ethnography and the Attitudinal Fallacy.” *Sociological Methods and Research* 43: 232-235. **Google Scholar**

Lamont, Michelle, and Ann Swidler. 2014. “Methodological Pluralism and the Possibilities and Limits of Interviewing.” *Qualitative Sociology* 37: 153-171. **Google Scholar**

Jerolmack, Colin and Shamus Khan. 2014. “Toward an Understanding of the Relationship Between Accounts and Action.” *Sociological Methods and Research* 43: 236-247. **Google Scholar**

## >> Week 9, Oct 22- 24 – Ethnography

### October 22 – Ethnographic Research

Whyte, William Foote. 1943. *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*, fourth edition. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Design Review due **October 22** of: Qualitative Interview

Marx, Matt. 2011. "The Firm Strikes Back: Non-compete Agreements and the Mobility of Technical Professionals." *American Sociological Review* 76: 695-712. **JSTOR**

### **October 24 – Selected Varieties and Challenges of Ethnography**

Tavory, Iddo, and Stefan Timmermans. 2009. "Two Cases of Ethnography: Grounded Theory and the Extended Case Method." *Ethnography* 10: 243-263. **Google Scholar**

Snow, David. 1980. "The Disengagement Process: A Neglected Problem in Participant Observation Research." *Qualitative Sociology* 3:100-122. **Google Scholar**

Luvaas, Brent. 2019. "Unbecoming: The aftereffects of autoethnography." *Ethnography* 20: 245-262. **OskiCat**

Reyes, Victoria. 2018. "Three models of transparency in ethnographic research: Naming places, naming people, and sharing data." *Ethnography* 19: 204-226. **OskiCat**

### **>> Week 10, Oct 29-31 – Qualitative Interviewing: Analysis and Critique**

#### **October 29 – Recording and Analyzing Ethnographic Data**

Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I Fretz, and Linda Shaw. 2001. "Participant Observation and Fieldnotes," pp. 352-368 in *Handbook of Ethnography*, edited by Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland, and Lyn Lofland. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Angrosino, Michael. 2007. "Analysing ethnographic data," pp. 67-77 in *Doing Ethnographic and Observational Research* by Michael Angrosino. London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd. **Google Scholar**

Abramson, Corey M., Jacqueline Joslyn, Katharine A. Rendle, Sarah B. Garrett, and Daniel Dohan. 2018. "The promises of computational ethnography: improving transparency, replicability, and validity for realist approaches to ethnographic analysis." *Ethnography* 19: 254-284. **Google Scholar**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW SECTION DUE OCTOBER 29 (S/U)\***

#### **October 31 – Selected Critical Assessments of Ethnography**

LeCompte, Margaret D., and Judith Preissle Goetz. 1982. "Problems of Reliability and Validity

in Ethnographic Research.” *Review of Research in Education* 52: 31-60. **Google Scholar**

Klinenberg, Eric. 2006. “Blaming the Victim: Hearsay, Labeling and the Hazards of Quick-Hit Disaster Ethnography.” *American Sociological Review* 71: 689-698. **JSTOR**

Rist, Ray C. 1980. “Blitzkrieg Ethnography: On the Transformation of a Method into a Movement.” *Educational Researcher* 9: 8-10. **Google Scholar**

Fine, Gary Alan. 1993. “Ten Lies of Ethnography: Moral Dilemmas of Field Research.” *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 22: 267-294. **Google Scholar**

## >> **Week 10, Nov 5-7 – Comparative/Historical Research**

### **November 5 – Comparative/Historical Research**

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Mahoney, James. 1999. “Nominal, Ordinal, and Narrative Appraisal in Macrocausal Analysis.” *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 1154-1196. **JSTOR**

Design Review due **November 5** of: Ethnography

Streib, Jessi. 2011. “Class Reproduction by Four Year Olds.” *Qualitative Sociology* 34: 337-352. **Google Scholar**

### **November 7 – Selecting and Collecting Comparative/Historical Data**

Emigh, Rebecca Jean. 1997. “The power of negative thinking: The use of negative case methodology in the development of sociological theory.” *Theory and Society* 26: 649-684. **Google Scholar**

Haydu, Jeffrey. 1998. “Making Use of the Past: Time Periods as Cases to Compare and Sequences of Problem-Solving.” *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 339-371. **JSTOR**

Hill, Michael R. 1993. “Archival Sedimentation,” pp. 8-19 in *Archival Strategies and Techniques*, by Michael R. Hill. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Myers, Daniel J. and Beth S. Caniglia. 2004. “All the Rioting That’s Fit to Print: Selection Effects in National Newspaper Coverage of Civil Disorders, 1968-1969.” *American Sociological Review* 69: 519-543. **JSTOR**

## >> **Week 11, Nov 12-14 – Critique of Comparative Historical Methods & Introduction to Selected Less Common Methods**

### **November 12 – Selected Critical Assessments of Comparative/Historical Research**

Lieberson, Stanley. 1991. "Small *N*'s and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases." *Social Forces* 70: 307-320.

**JSTOR**

Savolainen, Jukka. 1994. "The Rationality of Drawing Big Conclusions Based on Small Samples: In Defense of Mill's Methods." *Social Forces* 72:1217-1724. **JSTOR**

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." *Political Analysis* 2: 131-150. **JSTOR**

Sewell, William H., Jr. 1996. "Three Temporalities: Toward an Eventful Sociology," pp. 245-280 in *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*, edited by Terrence J. McDonald. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. **READER**

### **November 14 – Selected Less Common Methods**

Breslow, Norman. 1982. "Design and Analysis of Case-Control Studies." *Annual Review of Public Health* 3: 29-54. **Google Scholar**

Macy, Michael W., and Robert Willer. 2002. "From Factors to Actors: Computational Sociology and Agent-Based Modeling." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 143-166. **JSTOR**

Schelling, Thomas C. 1969. "Models of Segregation." *American Economic Review* 59: 488–493. **JSTOR**

Macal, Charles M., and Michael J. North. 2010. "Tutorial on agent-based modelling and simulation." *Journal of Simulation* 4: 151-162. **Google Scholar**

Edling, Christopher R. 2002. "Mathematics in Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 197-220. **JSTOR**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2009. "Stratification Theory, Socioeconomic Background, and Educational Attainment: A Formal Analysis." *Rationality and Society* 21: 459-511. **Google Scholar**

## **PART IV – COMPLEXITIES OF CASE SELECTION, CAUSALITY, & ETHICS**

### **>>Week 12, Nov 19-21 – Sampling/Case Selection**

#### **November 19 – Case Selection Strategies Under Challenging Circumstances: A Closer Inspection**

Watters, John K., and Patrick Biernacki. 1989. "Targeted Sampling: Options for the Study of

Hidden Populations.” *Social Problems* 36: 416-430. **JSTOR**

Gile, Krista J., Lisa G. Johnston, and Matthew J. Salganik. 2015. "Diagnostics for respondent-driven sampling." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* 178: 241-269. **Google Scholar**

Kanouse, David E., Sandra H. Berry, Naihua Duan, Janet Lever, Sally Carson, Judith F. Perlman, and Barbara Levitan. 1999. “Drawing a Probability Sample of Female Street Prostitutes in Los Angeles County.” *Journal of Sex Research* 36: 45-51. **JSTOR**

Blair, Johnny. 1999. "A probability sample of gay urban males: The use of two-phase adaptive sampling." *Journal of Sex Research* 36: 39-44. **Google Scholar**

Design Review due **November 19** of: Comparative/Historical  
Fairbrother, Malcolm. 2014. "Economists, Capitalists, and the Making of Globalization: North American Free Trade in Comparative-Historical Perspective." *American Journal of Sociology* 119: 1324-1379. **Google Scholar**

#### **November 21 – Noted? Accurate? Advice on Case Selection**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2014. "An Inconvenient Dataset: Bias and Inappropriate Inference with the Multilevel Model." *Quality & Quantity* 48: 1619-1649. **Google Scholar**

Small, Mario Luis. 2009. ““How Many Cases Do I Need?” On Science and the Logic of Case Selection in Field-Based Research.” *Ethnography* 10: 5-38. **Google Scholar**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2014. “Beyond the Existence Proof: Ontological Conditions, Epistemological Implications, and In-Depth Interview Research.” *Quality & Quantity* 48: 387-408. **Google Scholar**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2016. “Where the Rubber Meets the Road: Probability and Nonprobability Moments in Experiment, Interview, Archival, Administrative, and Ethnographic Data Collection.” *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 2: doi:10.1177/2378023116634709 **Google Scholar**

#### **>>Week 13, Nov 26-28 – Participants Research Proposals**

##### **November 26 –**

No Reading

**METHODS SECTION DUE NOVEMBER 26 (S/U)\***

##### **November 28 – THANKSGIVING**

## >> Week 14, Dec 3-5 – Causality and Ethics

### December 3 – Causality

Holland, Paul W. 1986. “Statistics and Causal Inference.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 396: 940-970. **JSTOR**

Lieberson, Stanley. 1985. “Rethinking Causality,” pp. 174-198 in *Making It Count: The Improvement of Social Research and Theory*, by Stanley Lieberson. Berkeley: University of California Press. **READER**

Manski, Charles F. 1995. “Introduction,” pp. 1-9 in *Identification Problems in the Social Sciences*, by Charles F. Manski. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. **READER**

### December 5 – Ethics: Principles and Practicalities

Levine, Robert J. 1979. “Clarifying the Concepts of Research Ethics.” *The Hastings Center Report* 9: 21-26. **JSTOR**

Freedman, Benjamin. 1987. “Scientific Value and Validity as Ethical Requirements for Research: A Proposed Explication.” *IRB: Ethics and Human Research* 9: 7-10. **JSTOR**

Rosenthal, Robert, and Peter David Blanck. 1993. “Science and Ethics in Conducting, Analyzing, and Reporting Social Science Research: Implications for Social Scientists, Judges, and Lawyers.” *Indiana Law Journal* 68: 1209-1228. **Google Scholar**

Bosk, Charles L. and Raymond G. De Vries. 2004. “Bureaucracies of Mass Deception: Institutional Review Boards and the Ethics of Ethnographic Research.” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 2004 595: 249-263. **Google Scholar**

Taylor, Steven J. 1987. “Observing Abuse: Professional Ethics and Personal Morality in Field Research.” *Qualitative Sociology* 10: 288-302. **OskiCat**

## >>Week 15, Dec 10-12 – Wrap-Up

### December 10 – Presentations

No Reading: Student Presentations of Research Question and Method

### December 12 – Presentations and Wrap-up

No Reading: Student Presentations of Research Question and Method, II, & Thematic Discussion

## >>Week 16, December 16 – Final Proposal due